

Technical Review Committee Meeting

Minutes of February 5, 2007

Attendance:

Members Present
Wayne Hamilton
Richard Grant
Mark Case
Mike Brookshire
Kevin Johnson
Scott Shuford

Members Absent
John Dankle
Bob Oast

Staff Present
Abby Moore
Kim Hamel
Chad Pierce
Ashleigh Shuford
Shannon Tuch
Nate Pennington
Julie Cogburn

Chairman Shuford opened the meeting at 1:34 explaining the role of the TRC and the voting process. Chairman Shuford noted that the Haw Creek Subdivision would be moved in front of The Ramble on the agenda. The 1/17/07 meeting minutes were approved with corrections that Wayne Hamilton and Richard Grant did not attend and Shannon Tuch chaired the meeting.

Agenda Item	
Level II review for the project identified as <u>The Overlook at Lake Julian Phase II</u> , located on Long Shoals Road. The request is for construction of a one-story medical and retail building. The owner is Holrob Investments, LLC and the contact is Jesse Gardner. The property is identified in the Buncombe County tax records as PIN 9644.07-79-1146.	
Staff Comments	Julia Cogburn oriented the Committee and audience to the site location and outlined the staff report, specifically noting items in regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Alternate parking plan with minimum compliance for HC accessibility for medical offices ? Pedestrian connection ? Clarification on limited installation of pedestrian protection on retaining wall ? FDC within 100' of fire hydrant ? Waterline easement
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Chris Eller responded to TRC comments/questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Master water meter was sent in for short extension ? TRC comments are minor in nature and can be addressed
Public Comments	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
Commission Action	
The TRC members voted unanimously to recommend approval subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report.	

Agenda Item	
Level III site plan review for the project identified as the <u>Westmont Commons Phase II</u> , located at 300 Q Landis Court for 72 apartments units. The owner is Westmont Commons Apartments, LLC and the contact is Jim Grdich. The property is identified in the Buncombe County tax records as PIN 9629.14-34-9022.	
Staff Comments	<p>Nathan Pennington oriented the Committee and audience to the site location and outlined the staff report, specifically noting items in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Landscape plan inconsistent ? Street trees and suitable species ? Proposed contours, limit, area and amount of grading ? State Building Code: HC accessibility, building exits, type of construction and sprinkler system if applicable ? Parking area lighting ? Proposal for trash ? Secondary access to Eliada Home Road remaining open though construction ? Pedestrian connection from the building to the public street ? Sidewalk across driveway to meet ADA requirements
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Bruce Nooe was available for questions, but had none himself.
Public Comments	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
No Public Comment	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
None.	
Commission Action	
The TRC members voted unanimously to recommend approval subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report.	

Agenda Item	
Preliminary plat review for the <u>Haw Creek Tract Subdivision</u> (43 lots) located at 48 Pinedale Street. The property owner is Set Sail Development, Inc. and the contact is Chris Day. The properties are identified in the Buncombe County Tax Records as PIN 9658.08-99-7961 & a portion of 0992. CONTINUED FROM THE 1/17 MEETING.	
Staff Comments	<p>Kim Hamel oriented the Committee and audience to the site location and outlined the staff report, specifically noting items in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Proposed construction of a new cul-de-sac and loop road with sidewalks that will serve the development ? Access to the subdivision will be off of Pinedale Street ? Open space ? Recorded boundary survey required ? Checklist items: control points, Owner's Certification, proposed road names, dimension ROW's

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Preliminary Plat: provide total acreage of site to resolve conflicts, Lot 38 doesn't meet standards, provide lot widths, revise flag lots 15, 25, 26, and 30, applicant to submit a separate application to request flexible development standard for a reduction in front setback from 25' to 15'. ? Public or private sidewalk system ? Maximum slope for private sidewalks ? There is a 36" waterline crossing southern portion of property; The LOC asked the owner to have it located, surveyed and shown on plans ? Project is subject the NC State Fire Code ? Turnaround required at the end of Road C, sanitation truck will not back up ? Small tributary stream on the east of the property is depicted as jurisdictional waters; therefore, all necessary NCDENR and Army Corp or Engineers permits will be required for culvert and /or stream modifications ? Sidewalk construction or fee-in-lieu of sidewalk construction will be required for property along Pinedale ? Valley curb will not be allowed due to proposed road slopes' ? All corner radii shall be 20' max ? Indicate average natural slope
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	<p>Chris Eller, civil engineer, responded to TRC comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Has met with Ken Putnam, Traffic Engineer ? Comments will be addressed ? Two parcels, but one has been subdivided ? Requests that road C be a private drive and the residents can pull containers down. Richard Grant okayed the suggestion ? Public roads will be ADA standards ? Natural slope is 13.85 ? 11/3/06 approval for transmission line for water. A 20' easement will be shown on final plat and in the field ? Welcome the condition of no permitting or construction for approval until 20' easement is marked boldly in the field and on plans ? Area with major transmission is a no construction area, but would also be willing to fence around area to ensure no construction or damage <p>Kevin Kerr, developer, responded to requests/concerns of the neighborhood (especially residents of Dogwood Grove).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Will try to preserve as much vegetation as possible ? Using existing trees as buffer ? 1800-2200 square foot houses (give or take a few larger and smaller) ? Open to putting in a fence, but would rather have the trees as buffer ? A reduction in the front setback of 10' will bring the houses closer to the street in the fronts of the houses, which could possibly increase the rear setback by 10', but not committing to anything at this time. <p>Chris Eller, responded to public comment/concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? There are two drainage basins. The developer recognizes there is a large amount water ? Developer will preserve open space to install underground detention. Also, along Haw Creek portion there will be either and above or underground device. Stormwater will be held and released slowly as to not have any more water than currently exists. ? Existing pipe is substandard. Chad Pierce noted that he had visited

	<p>the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? The developer is staying out of the wetlands area completely ? The pedestrian connection must lead to somewhere other than someone's back yard, but developer would be in agreement to put in a connection if there was an agreement from the party involved ? The developer not like to commit to the setback reduction, but will consider
Public Comments	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Jerry Dula Bob Gage Michael Smith Debbie Hensley Nancy Hyatt Norm Sipher Wes Clapp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Creek and a pond back towards the Blue Ridge Parkway that will cause flooding up to two feet when it rains. Lots 4,5, and 6 will be affected ? 36" culvert does not hold the water ? Number of proposed lots ? Wetlands will pose a problem ? Who monitors height on the houses ? Reduction to rear setbacks ? Density and congruence with the neighborhood ? Pedestrian connection ? Evaluation of run-off ? Downward slope runs off into Haw Creek ? Project will cause more stormwater issues ? Pinedale Road is a very narrow road; any improvements? ? Security concerns ? Request fence and extra buffering
Commission Comments/Discussion	
<p>Chairman Shuford asked the developer, Kevin Kerr to answer questions and the requests of the neighborhood that could not be required by the City as a technical requirement regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Limiting height to 30' ? Provide fence as a buffer between existing neighborhood and new development ? Preserve exiting trees and plant evergreens ? Increase rear setback to 40' <p>Kim Hamel noted that street lights would be installed along the new internal street only</p> <p>Chairman Shuford noted that Pinedale Road is 18' wide and our standard is 20', so it's not much narrower than our standard. Richard Grant also agreed that it is not uncommon to have 18' wide streets throughout the city.</p> <p>Chairman Shuford explained how the height of a building/dwelling in the City is measured.</p>	
Commission Action	
<p>The TRC voted unanimously to approve the project with the conditions outlined in the staff report with the added conditions that the 36" waterline and associated 20' easement be boldly identified on the plan and in the field and that no permits or site work may be initiated until all concerns have been addressed.</p>	

Agenda Item

Preliminary plat review for The Ramble – South of Dingle Section (163 lots) located on Ramble Way. The property owner is Ramble Biltmore Forest, LLC the contact is Will Buie. The property is identified in the Buncombe County Tax Records as PIN 9645.01-46-2202.

Staff Comments

Julia Cogburn oriented the Committee and audience to the site location and outlined the staff report, specifically noting items in regard to:

- ? Land for future development needs to be clearly indicated as such.
- Land for open space needs to be indicated as such so there is confirmation of the open space and calculations
- ? Refer to UDO for flags lots and their conformity
- ? The proposal with respect to street tree provision is accepted and we will proceed to work with you on this as we did in Phase I
- ? Proposed gate entrance and AFR standards
- ? The submitted review package is missing vital information
- ? Trails in lieu of street side sidewalk
- ? ADA requirements and trails
- ? Encroachments and crossings of jurisdictional waters
- ? Average natural slope and maximum allowable disturbance area
- ? Topographical survey
- ? New application needed for MSD allocation letter

Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)

Will Buie, developer, responded to TRC comments and proposed questions regarding the following:

- ? Applicant was hoping to get preliminary approval for a master plan and then come back with specifics on lots/phases with each department
- ? Trails and sidewalks
- ? During NOD approval, the applicant had asked specifically to have technical components be allowed with SOD
- ? Would like to look at The Ramble in totality
- ? Emergency access; Existing gate houses have full access and meet standards
- ? The applicant has looped the road, but would like a temporary turnaround until construction is complete. 1100' cul-de-sac (looped as per Cathy Ball)
- ? Would like K-value of 10 on a limited number of the roads, even though the standard is 18. Chad Pierce suggested the developer meet with Ken Putnam to discuss
- ? Phasing plans was submitted with packet, 20-30 lots per phase
- ? The topographical survey was approved before a signed professional ground topographical survey was required. Chad Pierce strongly suggested a professional group topographical survey be done because a flown topographical survey are not as accurate
- ? Would request that they are granted approval with conditions

Public Comments

Speaker Name

Issue(s)

Robert Cox Jones Sylvia Cox Patsy Brison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Water taps ? Sewer taps ? Gates ? No information has been able to be obtained ? Would request the density remain low in brown area of plan ? Would like a better understanding of the phases and what's happening ? Request that once phasing is approved that it can't be changed ? Patsy Brison, representing Michael Verbel, had comments regarding the following: ? Proposed stormwater on Dingle Creek ? Request that a study take place on the stormwater before premature approval takes place ? Ms. Brison presented picture of her client's flooded yard. ? Ms. Brison requested that careful review take place because of Dingle Creek. Chad Pierce responded that he had been in contact with her clients and there is a contract with McGill and Associates for a master study of Dingle Creek. Chairman Shuford noted that Ms. Brison's clients property is upstream from the development
Commission Comments/Discussion	
<p>Chairman Shuford noted that once a project is in the pipeline for review it will fall under the Hillside Standards that are in place at that time. Chairman Shuford also requested that review of how the NOD review and approval took place.</p> <p>Shannon Tuch noted the difference now is that NOD was in the ETJ at the time of approval; therefore, it was not subject to the City's review of the State Building Code. Trails should be handled in another meeting to look at the intent of the ordinance and to identify the trails that need to meet the accessibility requirements. Ms. Tuch expressed that the project was not ready for approval and that the following items need to be addressed: phasing plan, clarification on trails, street lights, road standards and an on-ground topographical survey be taken.</p> <p>Chad Pierce asked for clarification as to whether or not the trail system fee in lieu works same as sidewalk fee in lieu. Is the trail system for connectivity or an amenity to the residents?</p>	
Commission Action	
<p>Richard Grant made a motion to table the project to a date undetermined and Kevin Johnson seconded the motion.</p>	